

Journal of Socialist Party of Canada

FULCRUM

vol 9
1976
no 2

with a lever long enough and a fulcrum strong enough
the world can be moved

FOOD DESTRUCTION



Also in this issue:
Revolutionary Conservatives
The Futility of Terrorism
Hardworking Capitalists
The Trotskyists

SOAPBOX

Reader's turn on the stand

Dear Sir:

I received this pamphlet (Introducing The Socialist Party of Canada) the day of the demonstration at the Parliament Buildings during the protest against the insurance hikes and I do like to hear every side to every story. But when I read your pamphlet I felt that you were bucking too many things at one time to ever succeed in whatever goals you may have started from, and your talk of succeeding by democratic control is something I just don't understand. As far as Canada is concerned, from this article from the Colonist you aren't even mentioned in Who's Who, so since this is the only system we know, how do we go about changing things. I couldn't be a member because I am not a worker any more, and living on my pensions provided by the society that now exists. I'm not at all active in Politics except to vote, but watching the methods used just this week-end to select a leader for the Conservative Party, wouldn't it be lovely if we could throw all the contending doctrines into one hat or convention and end up with just one. But then it would never be a Democracy, and you would have no chance at all, because you are not a candidate, at least, not in Canada. I know that there are many things that need changing, but I'm afraid it will be tomorrow before you succeed and perhaps I am wrong. But I do think you are bucking too much, because there are too few, even working people all that dissatisfied with present day conditions. There is the fringe that still exists below the decent level and perhaps there are other countries not quite so fortunate, but I think you are planning for heaven itself, and people being as they are, are far from being ready for that condition.

My idea of being a Socialist was to share the health, wealth and the happiness but this is just a figure of speech, and no one ever expects that it will ever happen, at least not in our time. So perhaps you are prepared to wait. Perhaps there will be a time for you, but I doubt that it will be speedy since you must be hostile to every other party and they just won't let you.

Well I wish you much luck.

Mrs. G.P.

REPLY

No it would not "be lovely if we could throw all the contending doctrines into one convention and end up with just one." In countries, such as Russia, Spain, China, Chile, Cuba, where exists a situation similar to what is suggested it is far from lovely. It is difficult to understand how anyone could consider the Conservative Convention "lovely." Behind the facade of the television

camera was all the ugliness of back-room vote trades, campaign financiers and what they expect for their finances. There certainly were no conflicting doctrines here. All the participants supported capitalism. The only conflict was, which sections of the capitalist class will get what deal. In a sense, it mirrors the total politics of capitalism and out of such a melting pot only a concept of capitalism can arise.

It is understandable how some may regard the array of numerically large and financially powerful capitalist political parties as insurmountable obstacles to socialism. And it is also true that the hostility of the Socialist Party to all other political parties is nothing other than a mirror of the hostility all capitalist parties from left to right have for socialism. This feeling of impotence, undoubtedly is a major factor in the apparent lack of discontent on the part of the working class. However, it should be remembered that the capitalist class once appeared impotent in face of the immense entrenched power of the feudal aristocracy. Neither was the revolutionary change the result of great orators or leaders (although such existed on both sides). It was simply that the feudal restrictions were incompatible with the changing productive mode. So it was that the history of productivity built the stage. All that was necessary was for the budding capitalist class to step up and act out their part. Now the capitalist productive mode is building a new platform of crisis. Just as the feudal restrictions were incompatible with the new productive mode now the capitalist productive mode is more and more becoming incompatible with its distributive mode, namely, ever increasing productive potential with consumption restricted to what can be bought.

Unmistakably, the platform for a new stage in human history is being built. It awaits the working class to step up and act out its part. True enough, the working class have shown itself to be a shy reluctant and somewhat misdirected player. This in part can be credited to the brainwashing machine of capitalism, which is the most sophisticated ever developed in the history of man. Nevertheless, the stage awaits with ever increasing problems until the act is played out. And all the brainwashing in the world will not make it disappear.

Socialists are accused of bucking too many things. Au contraire. It is the supporters of capitalism that buck "too many things." They buck a mountain of evils. But they want to keep the cause of those evils — capitalism itself. They are in an impossible position. Socialists, rather than tinker with a myriad of evil effects, tackle the one cause of those evils. — Socialists set their sails in one direction — the replacing of the capitalist productive and distributive mode with the socialist productive and distributive mode — common ownership and production for use. True enough, this may seem like heaven compared to the hell of capitalism.

Confusion of the definition of "worker" etc. is common. Retirement does not take one out of the working class any more than working takes Nelson Rockefeller out of the capitalist class. Nor does one's class have any bearing upon their eligibility for membership in The Socialist Party of Canada. True enough the working class must be the dominant factor in the socialist revolution. This arises from the fact that it is the working class that have an interest in their own emancipation and that because as socialist revolution, from its very nature, must be democratic combined with the pure mathematics that the working class outnumber the capitalist class ten to one. The only precondition for membership in the Socialist Party of Canada is an understanding of the socialist objective and a determination to make this socialist objective one's sole political pursuit. l.t.

Dear Comrades:

I am interested in learning the difference, as you see it, between "leftist parties" and "socialist parties". I am especially interested in "Socialisme Mondiale" because I'm looking around for a good French-language paper. I am curious about your positions on the following: the NDP, nationalism and Canadianization of unions, Angola, Chinese foreign policy and the controversy in Western European CP's over abolition of the "dictatorship of the proletariat".

Fraternally,

W.L.B., Toronto

REPLY

Aside from their names, leftist parties are difficult to distinguish from rightist parties, especially while in office. All parties of the left-center-right spectrum assume the omniscience and infinity of the capital vs. wage-labor relationship, or the division of society into owners and non-owners of the means of life, and attempt to redress social wrongs within that framework. As the sentence from the ancient Anglican prayer puts it: "As it was in the beginning, is now and ever shall be" etc., static, non-changing view. The Socialist Party of Canada, on the other hand, contends that nothing of consequence can be done by the workers for themselves while they remain as wage-slaves, that the foregoing social division, as the cause of their problems, must be removed or ended as the only possible solution. The SPC regards human society, like the rest of the observable universe, as ever changing and changeable. These are the reasons why all other parties are poles apart from the SPC in this country, and why the others are basically similar while we differ fundamentally. The SPC works for basic or revolutionary change to common ownership and democratic control. The rest do not, and oppose this objective.

Most reforms to capitalism in Canada, notably those prompted by the Regina Manifesto, have been brought in by the openly capitalist or "old line" parties in office. Many of these reforms had been advocated by the Liberal and Conservative Parties back as far as the turn of the century, a long time before the Regina Manifesto had been written, or the CCF-NDP formed to make Liberal-Conservative patchwork to capitalism look like "Socialism".

Nationalism is an ideological cover for the interests of the owning class to promote the political fraud of an alleged common interest among all the people of any nation.

Canadian unions, meaning less or no control by US or other countries' head offices would make little difference to the effectiveness of the economic struggle of Canadian workers against the encroachments of capital. What would enhance this struggle is greater conscious participation, (hence democratic control) by workers in their unions, whether the unions be international or not. But this will not likely come before increasing working class Socialist knowledge of capitalism.

The war in Angola began as a struggle by the native Angolan entrepreneurial class for freedom from the restrictions of the former and old-fashioned type Portuguese capitalist domination. But these affairs cannot be isolated from the web of world capitalism in general and the capitalist giants in particular, and the Angolan war soon became a contest involving the US, Russia, (and France & China at first) over the rich resources of that country. Naturally, as in every war, and in line with capitalist practice both in "peace" and in war, the sordid struggle over loot is concealed by ideologies to induce the propertiless to do the working, fighting and dying.

Of course the Russian and Chinese bosses, manqué-raded as usual as "Communists", with the Chinese on the same side as the US and the Russians against. Western news reports labelled the MPLA (Peoples' Movement For the Liberation of Angola) as "Marxist" despite the fact that Henry Kissinger said he saw no ideological difference between the three national liberation groups and that the US could have supported any one of them. Now that the MPLA is in control, the US has indicated it will co-operate, in looking after its investment interests in that country.

Nothing of consequence has or will change for the workers, except a further change in outside masters, in concert with the home-grown ones. The role of the workers is to be conned into expanding capital, local and international, and this keynote was exemplified by the leader of one of the former capitalist liberation movements Jonas Savimbi of UNITA. As slick politician he charmed his wage-slave audience, as reported in Time, Feb. 2/76, and made pleas for hard work and long hours.

"In Europe and America they work as much as possible. We too must work hard to build Angola."

Again the capitalist interest was disguised in nationalism. To paraphrase Marx, if a backward nation wants to know its future, look at the advanced nations. Angolan workers have little to look forward to until they learn about capitalism and combine with the rest of the world's victims to end it.

Chinese foreign policy of course will reflect the trading, raw material and strategic interests of the owner-rulers of China, the same as with any other country. All countries being capitalist, either of the state or the private variety.

The infinite ideological hair-splitting between the various "Communist" parties reflects capitalist conflict between different nations in which these anti-working class parties find themselves. The static between Russia and China for instance looks very much like that between any other two normal capitalist nations. The reason for this is that Russia and China are two normal capitalist nations. As there seems to be controversy among west European C.P.'s over abolition of the "dictatorship of the Proletariate", this could only mean that the "communist" Parties in countries where civil rights prevail, and who no longer serve their former Moscow bosses, feel they can appeal to the working class electorate better if they present a program of multi-party capitalist democracy along with their usual reforms. However, the Russian government was never a "dictatorship of the proletariat" (dictatorship of 90 per cent over the 10 per cent) but a dictatorship of the Bolshevik party over the workers and peasants, of Russia. Furthermore, only about 20 per cent of the useful class in Russia in 1917 were proletarians. Which means the Bolsheviks at the time dictated mostly over peasants, with the aim of replacing feudalism with state capitalism, which is what they have finally done.

The expression "dictatorship of the proletariat" was a term Marx rarely used to describe the democratic transition if the workers achieved power for Socialism 100 years ago, during which the means of production would be built to the extent that enough could be produced for all, and common ownership made possible. Long since, capitalism has done this job. Productive potential is now so great that a transition period will not be required. When the world's victims understand it and want it and win the necessary elections, Socialism can be established immediately. G.J.

CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIALISM

Commencing in the next issue FULCRUM will reproduce, in series, the late Horace Jarvis' work, Christianity and Socialism

Dear Sirs:

Page 12 of your circular states your "Objective" and declares your "Principles". What interests me more is the "Means" you hope to use to attain the "Objectives" and practice the "Principles." I am completely in sympathy with the "Objectives." I can say the same thing about non-communists, but certainly not with its leading exponents, especially Russia. Considering the great handicap of illiteracy in the Russia of 50-60 years ago I can't be too severe on their socialists? of that time for the means they adopted to attain their objective.

Part of your declaration of principles disturbs me. It savors of one serious weakness — intolerance. I must confess that is one mistake for which I have little, or no, tolerance.

One criticism of articles in your pamphlet I feel must be made is that very often they strike me as being like flailing arms about in the dark hoping to elicit some sort of response from an elusive enemy lurking there.

I would like to know just how your conception of socialism compares with that of Russia, of China, of the Scandinavian countries, of India, of Britain's Laborites, of the OCF or its "Waffle" group, or the present replacement for our old OCF the NDP.

Evidently you denigrate practically all "Government," so how do you suggest implementing and administering the "Society" which you envision? I may be a bit obtuse, so please try to be explicit on answering my queries.

Thank you.

Boyd B. Wood

P.S. I too wrote a letter to one of your Vancouver papers commenting on the last BC election — and it was not published. BB

PEPILY

The means of achieving the socialist objective have, often enough, been enunciated in the columns of this paper. As Nos. 6 & 8 of the Declaration of Principles clearly indicate, Socialists "enter the field of political action" "consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government." It should be quite clear that this "conquest" can only occur when a majority understand, desire, and therefore vote for, the socialist objective.

You put a question mark behind what you choose to call the "Socialists" of Russia. But there should be no question on this. The 1917 Revolution in Russia was definitely not socialist. The illiteracy, to which you refer, and the lack of industrialization prevented that. So, had its leaders wanted to impose socialism on an unwilling or unwitting majority they were destined to fail. However, it is clear that their objective was not socialism, but state capitalism. In the later objective they were successful.

Principle no 7 disturbs you. However this principle is in no way born of intolerance but rather of deep and serious study, and some sad experiences. How can a political party dedicated to the overthrow of capitalism be anything other than hostile to political parties that are dedicated to the perpetuation of capitalism? In the political arena it is not intolerance that causes you to oppose your enemy. Be assured that, though they may not express it in so many words, all capitalist parties, be they called Liberal, Social Democrat, Trotskyist, Maoist or whatever, exhibit considerable hostility towards the Socialist Party of Canada. And as to intolerance some of them have been quite physical in their attempts to suppress free expression of Socialist ideas.

All the countries, you mention, are in various stages of capitalism. There are, in fact, no socialist countries in the world.

The old Regina Manifesto of the CCF opened with a bit of Socialist window dressing. But window dressing was all it was. The rest of the Manifesto concerned itself with the reforming and run-

ning of capitalism. The NDP naturally arrived at where the Regina Manifesto was aimed. Indeed, if the founders of the CCF really wanted socialism the CCF would not have come into being. They would have simply joined the Socialist Party of Canada which had prior existence. The Waffle is just a bit more Nazi than some of the rest. Their nationalism tends to pit worker against worker for the benefit of the Capitalist class. The working class certainly have no friend in nationalization. For the capitalist class, it means security with guaranteed returns on their government bonds. For the worker the state, with all its power, becomes the capitalist. As Frederick Engels so aptly put it in SOCIALISM - UTOPIAN and SCIENTIFIC - the class struggle is in no way diminished. It is rather intensified.

The Socialist Party of Canada has no involvement in whatever Vancouver paper you wrote to. The Party journals are: FULCRUM and (in French) SOCIALISME MONDIAL; both printed in Victoria. The Companion Party journals, from other countries, are listed on the back cover.

**"Terror is noisy.
It catches the
headlines. But
seen in histori-
cal perspective,
it has hardly
ever had a
lasting effect."**

The Futility of Terrorism

Too often socialists are prone to say, to the effect, that "violence will not work." This is far too flatfooted and incomplete a stand to take on a subject that is so prominent today.

Certainly the bombings and destruction of property that occurred in the struggles in the early history of the American labour unions made more totalitarian suppression by the state more acceptable to the rest of the population and had the effect of setting union organization back many, many years. But, on the other hand, the destruction of property was a factor in accelerating the suffragette's demands for the vote and the great destruction in the American city of Watts did result in a number of social reforms. Before the advocates of violence begin waving the flag of victory they should look at the social misery that is reentrenched stronger than ever in Watts and after looking at the very little use women have made of the ballot ask whether it would have made that much difference if it had taken another

10, 20 or 50 years to achieve the franchise? Are women any less politically illiterate? Surely, today's women's pussy-cat organizations with no higher aim than equal wage slavery with men would make the Pankhursts spit up.

A more complete socialist stand on violence is that it is odds on that the most inevitable resulting setbacks by far outweigh the remote chance of some microscopic temporary gain. Certainly socialism, with its natural democracy, never has nor never can be achieved by undemocratic minority violence. It is cheery to see socialists aversion to violence substantiated in one of the finer literary bastions of capitalism - Harper's Magazine (March '76). Walter Laqueur, in an article on Terrorism, correctly analyzes that the prime target, the murdered diplomats, women and children, are not the terrorist's main objective which is the secondary target - the audience of sensational newspaper headlines. However observes Laqueur:

it is not true that terrorists some-

how acquire "monstrous power" (to quote our editorials) if they kidnap a few dozen officers, as in Holland, or even a dozen oil ministers, as in Vienna. If a mass murder had happened in Vienna on that Sunday before Christmas, long obituaries of Stokk Yanson and his colleagues would have been published—and within twenty-four hours, ambitious and competent men in Tehran and Caracas, in Baghdad and in Kuwait, would have replaced them. Terrorists and newspapermen share the naive assumption that those whose names make the headlines have power, that getting one's name on the front page is a major political achievement. This assumption typifies the prevailing muddled thinking on the subject of terrorism.

With the change from rural to urban industrial society the terrorist's previous methods of organization were no longer possible. The terrorists now organize themselves into surprisingly small units. Laqueur capitalizes the results of this change:

With the transfer of operations from the countryside to the cities, the age of the "urban guerrilla" dawned. But the very term "urban guerrilla" is problematical. There have been revolutions, civil wars, insurrections, and coups d'état in the cities, but hardly ever guerrilla warfare. That occurs in towns only if public order has completely collapsed, and if armed bands roam freely. Such a state of affairs is rare, and it never lasts longer than a few hours, at most a few days. Either the insurgents overthrow the government in a frontal assault, or they are defeated. The title "urban guerrilla" is in fact a public-relations term for terrorism; terrorists usually dislike being called terrorists, preferring the more romantic guerrilla image.

There are basic differences between the rural guerrilla and the urban terrorist: mobility and hiding are the essence of guerrilla warfare, and this is impossible in towns. It is not true that the slums (and the rich quarters) of the big cities provide equally good sanctuaries. Rural guerrillas operate in large units and gradually transform themselves into battalions, regiments, and even divisions. They carry out political and social reforms in "liberated zones," openly propagandize, and build up their organizational network. In towns, where this cannot be done, urban terrorists operate in units of three, four, or five; the whole "movement" consists of a few hundred, often only a few dozen, members. This is the source of their operational strength and their political weakness. For while it is difficult to detect small groups, and while they

can cause a great deal of damage, politically they are impotent. A year or two ago astute newspaper readers in the Western world were led to believe that the German Baader-Meinhof group, the Japanese Red Army, the Symbionese Liberation Army, and the British Angry Brigade were mass movements that ought to be taken very seriously indeed. Their "communiques" were published in the mass media; there were earnest sociological and psychological studies on the background of their members; their "ideology" was analyzed in tedious detail. Yet these were groups of between five and fifty members. Their only victories were in the area of publicity.

In exposing a lot of the mythology surrounding terrorism Laqueur probably deals it a greater blow than all the tear gas in the world:

THE CURRENT terrorist epidemic has mystified a great many people, and various explanations have been offered—most of them quite wrong. Only a few will be mentioned here:

Political terror is a new and unprecedented phenomenon. It is as old as the hills, only the manifestations of terror have changed. The present epidemic is mild compared with previous outbreaks. There were more assassinations of leading statesmen in the 1890s in both America and Europe, when terrorism had more supporters, than at the present time. Nor is terrorist doctrine a novelty. In 1884 Johannes Most, a German Social Democrat turned anarchist, published in New York a manual, *Revolutionary (Urban) Warfare*, with the subtitle "A Handbook of Instruction Regarding the Use and Manufacture of Nitroglycerine, Dynamite, Gun-cotton, Fulminating Mercury, Bombs, Arson, Poisons, etc." Most pioneered the idea of the letter bomb and argued that the liquidation of "pigs" was not murder because murder was the willful killing of a human being, whereas policemen did not belong in this category.

It is sometimes argued that guerrilla and terrorist movements in past ages were sporadic and essentially apolitical. But this is not so: the Russian anarchists of the last century were as well organized as any contemporary movement, and their ideological and political sophistication was, if anything, higher. The same goes for the guerrilla wars of the nineteenth century. The guerrilla literature published in Europe in the 1830s and 1840s is truly modern in almost every respect. It refers to "bases," "liberated

areas," "protracted war" as well as the gradual transformation of guerrilla units into a regular army. The basic ideas of Mao and Castro all appeared at least a hundred years ago.

Terrorism is left-wing and revolutionary in character. Terrorists do not believe in liberty or equality or fraternity. Historically, they are elitists, contemptuous of the masses, believing in the historical mission of a tiny minority. It was said about the Tupamaros that one had to be a Ph.D. to be a member. This was an exaggeration but not by very much. Their manifestos may be phrased in left-wing language, but previous generations of terrorists proclaimed Fascist ideas. Nineteenth-century European partisans and guerrillas fighting Napoleon were certainly right-wing. The Spanish guerrilleros wanted to reintroduce the Inquisition; the Italian burned the houses of all citizens suspected of left-wing ideas. Closer to our own period, the IRA and the Macedonian IMRO at various times in their history had connections with Fascism and Communism. The ideology of terrorist movements such as the Stern gang and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine encompasses elements of the extreme Left and Right. Slogans change with intellectual fashions and should not be taken too seriously. The real inspiration underlying terrorism is a free-floating activism that can with equal ease turn right or left. It is the action that counts.

Terrorism appears whenever people have genuine, legitimate grievances. Remove the grievance and terror will cease. The prescription seems plausible enough, but experience does not bear it out. On the level of abstract reasoning it is, of course, true that there would be no violence if no one had a grievance or felt frustration. But in practice there will always be disaffected, alienated, and highly aggressive people claiming that the present state of affairs is intolerable and that only violence will bring a change. Some of their causes may even be real and legitimate—but unfulfillable. This applies to the separatist demands of minorities, which, if acceded to, would result in the emergence of nonviable states and the crippling of society. It is always the fashion to blame the state or the "system" for every existing injustice. But some of the problems may simply be insoluble, at least in the short run. No state or social system can be better than the individuals constituting it.

It is ultimately the perception of grievance

that matters, not the grievance itself. At one time a major grievance may be fatalistically accepted, whereas at another time (or elsewhere) a minor grievance may produce the most violent reaction. A comparison of terrorist activities over the last century shows, beyond any shadow of doubt, that violent protest movements do not appear where despotism is worst but, on the contrary, in permissive democratic societies or ineffective authoritarian regimes. There were no terrorist movements in Nazi Germany, nor in Fascist Italy, nor in any of the Communist countries. The Kurdish insurgents were defeated by the Iraqi government in early 1975 with the greatest of ease, whereas terrorism in Ulster continues for many years now and the end is not in sight. The Iraqis succeeded not because they satisfied the grievances of the Kurds but simply because they could not care less about public opinion abroad.

Terror is highly effective. Terror is noisy; it catches the headlines. Its melodrama inspires horror and fascination. But seen in historical perspective, it has hardly ever had a lasting effect. Guerrilla wars have been successful only against colonial rule, and the age of colonialism is over. Terrorism did have a limited effect at a time of general war, but only in one instance (Cuba) has a guerrilla movement prevailed in peacetime. But the constellation in Cuba was unique and, contrary to Castro's expectations, there were no repeat performances elsewhere in Latin America. The Vietnam war in its decisive phase was no longer guerrilla in character. There is no known case in modern history of a terrorist movement seizing political power, although terror has been used on the tactical level by radical political parties. Society will tolerate terrorism as long as it is no more than a nuisance. Once insecurity spreads and terror becomes a real danger, the authorities are no longer blamed for disregarding human rights in their struggle against it. On the contrary, the cry goes up for more repressive measures, irrespective of the price that has to be paid in human rights. The state is always so much stronger than the terrorists, whose only hope for success is to prevent the authorities from using their full powers. If the terrorist is the fish—following Mao Tse-tung's parable—the permissiveness and the inefficiency of liberal society is the water. As Régis Debray, apostle of the Latin-American guerrillas, wrote about the Tupamaros: "By digging the grave of lib-

eral Uruguay, they dug their own grave."

The importance of terrorism will grow enormously in the years to come as the destructive power of its weapons increases. This danger does indeed exist, with the increasing availability of missiles, nuclear material, and highly effective poisons. But it is part of a wider problem, that of individuals blackmailing society. To engage in nuclear ransom, a "terrorist movement" is not needed; a small group of madmen or criminals, or just one person, could be equally effective—perhaps even more so. The smaller the group, the more difficult it would be to identify and combat.

Political terrorists are more intelligent and less cruel than "ordinary" criminals. Most political terrorists in modern times have been of middle- or upper-class origin, and many of them have had a higher education. Nevertheless, they have rarely shown intelligence, let alone political sophistication. Larger issues and future perspectives are of little interest to them, and they are quite easily manipulated by foreign intelligence services. As for cruelty, the "ordinary" criminal, unlike the terrorist, does not believe in indiscriminate killing. He may torture a victim, but this will be the exception, not the rule, for he is motivated by material gain and not by fanaticism. The motivation of the political terrorist is altogether different. Since, in his eyes, everyone but himself is guilty, restraints do not exist.

Political terror therefore tends to be less humane than the variety practiced by "ordinary" criminals. The Palestinian terrorists have specialized in killing children, while the Provisional IRA has concentrated its attacks against Protestant workers, and this despite their professions of "proletarian internationalism." It is the terrorists' aim not just to kill their opponents but to spread confusion and fear. It is part of the terrorist indoctrination to kill the humanity of the terrorist—all this, of course, for a more humane and just world order.

Terrorists are poor, hungry, and desperate human beings. Terrorist groups without powerful protectors are indeed poor. But modern transnational terrorism is, more often than not, big business. According to a spokesman of the Palestine "Rejection Front" in an interview with the Madrid newspaper *Platforma*, the income of the PLO is as great as that of certain Arab countries, such as Jordan, with payments by the oil countries on the order of \$150 million to \$200 million. Officials of the organizations

are paid \$5,000 a month and more, and everyone gets a car as a matter of course; they have acquired chalets and bank accounts in Switzerland. But the "Rejection Front," financed by Iraq, Libya, and Algeria is not kept on a starvation diet either. The Argentine ERP and the Montoneros have amassed many millions of dollars through bank robberies and extortion. Various Middle Eastern and East European governments give millions to terrorist movements from Ulster to the Philippines. This abundance of funds makes it possible to engage in all kinds of costly operations, to bribe officials, and to purchase sophisticated weapons. At the same time, the surfeit of money breeds corruption. The terrorists are no longer lean and hungry after prolonged exposure to life in Hilton hotels. They are still capable of carrying out gangster-style operations of short duration, but they become useless for long campaigns involving hardship and privation.

Laqueur is not consistent in his aversion to terrorism. He feels it is sometimes justified:

All this is not to say that political terror is always reprehensible or could never be effective. The assassination of Hitler or Stalin in the 1920s or 1930s would not only have changed the course of history, it would have saved the lives of millions of people. Terrorism is morally justified whenever there is no other remedy for an intolerable situation. Yet it seldom occurs, and virtually never succeeds, where tyranny is harshest.

It is difficult to understand how Laqueur could be so unscientific on this point. He realizes that a dozen murdered oil ministers would be replaced "within twenty-four hours." How is it then that he could not comprehend that with equal speed a Gobelts or Goering would replace Hitler or a Stalin could be replaced by an equally villainous Trotsky or a score of others run from the same mould.

Laqueur goes on to appeal to newspaper people, politicians and social workers not to give the desired exposure and thus involuntary help to terrorists. That may happen. But the important lesson here, for the working class, is to learn the extreme limitations and ultimate frustrations and futility of terrorism. Devoid, though it may be, from excitement and headlines, the socialist method of education and organization towards a majority movement is not just the best way to achieve social democracy. IT IS THE ONLY WAY.

Larry Ticker

There are some favorite arguments circulated by the defenders of world capitalism to make a co-operative Socialist society of free abundance and voluntary work look impractical or impossible. They include such theories as inherent human greed, lack of working class intelligence, and the idea that current society can be reformed to serve everybody. Another of these theories is that man does not know how to produce enough to satisfy all his needs.



FOOD DESTRUCTION

A strange contradiction exists between the idea that attempts are being made to produce food for all, on the one hand, and the fact of widespread food destruction on the other, along with charity appeals to feed starving people. The latest local example is the dumping of nearly a thousand tons of herring into deep pits by Oakland Industries fish processors. An attempt was made to keep this particular dumping operation secret, but a Socialist Party of Canada member, living near the area of the pits, cooperated to let the story out.

The destroyed herring result from the extraction of roe which is processed into caviar by the Japanese. The fish are treated with brine, which stiffens their bodies, thereby cheapening the process of popping out the roe and sweetening the taste of the resultant profits. Ridding the carcasses of the brine increases the processing cost so that profits are too low or eliminated entirely and the rest of the fish is not available for human or animal consumption. In other words, the brine treatment increases profit via a small amount of gourmet delicacy but, by so doing, it destroys a large amount of protein, vitamin and mineral source, on which human labor has already been expended. This is a small example of how capitalism wastes and destroys to operate normally.

A spokesman for the industry said that of the 87,000 tons expected catch on the Canadian west coast this year, only 15 per cent was for human consumption. He said, "It was a shocking situation that thousands of tons of herring were caught each year just to extract the roe". Such righteous indignation, but oh, just love those profits — and the profit system.

More Examples -

The durability of the myth that world capitalism, state and private, tries to accommodate all the people, in the face of massive food destruction and restrictions on production, is amazing. Thousands of tons of fruit fall to the ground and rot off trees in back yards and vacant lots in the Greater Victoria area alone. Local produce farm-

ers have destroyed unmarketable potatoes. Western Canadian farmers have destroyed vegetables and beef calves to protest high costs-low prices, or in silent resignation.

In the late 60's and early 70's Canadian farmers were ordered by the government to cut back on grain production and to enforce the edict the servant of the capitalist class bled spy planes to monitor the farmers' fields to insure that they all obeyed. Twenty-eight million eggs were destroyed by the government in 1974 because they could not be sold. Recently, tons of produced milk that got a little too old were converted to animal feed. The liberal-left and conservative right in the mass media were shocked and told the workers what a terrible shame this was. Canadian farmland is being lost at the rate of 122,000 acres a year. Farmers are abandoning their occupation at the rate of 13,000 per year because it no longer pays. (Maclean's Feb/75)



Mountains of rotting tomatoes are dumped in Germany

The capitalist world is obsessed in commodities, goods and services to be sold at a profit, including the commodity known as the human power to labor from which all these values and surplus values arise. Capitalist production is completely unconcerned about people outside of and not required for its economic process of profit making.

A report in the "Free Press Report on Farming", March 26/75, emphasized the farmer opposition to the idea of a stockpile of food for world "emergencies". The writer went on to say about grain:

All it takes is a little horse sense to figure out that any time a buyer knows that there is a ready supply standing by, he is not going to bid as high as he otherwise would.

When food is produced for profits, profits win every time. In the farm magazine, WISCONSIN FARMER, April 1/75, an alarming headline announced: World Must Start Choosing Lower Prices in U.S. This was not a cruel April Fool's joke. Capitalism must be concerned about dollars. Recently, 41,000 children die from the combined effects of malnutrition and infection every day. (Worldwatch, Daily Colonist, March 26/75) This

malnutrition is in harsh contrast with an estimated productive potential capable of feeding a world of 30 billion. (UNESCO publication CHRONIC, July-August, 1962.)

India, which is one of the chronic starvation areas, "... could feed the world," according to D. Patrick Roydhan, retiring U.S. Ambassador (New Zealand Herald, 3/2/75). With one-third of U.S. productive capacity standing idle, according to AFL-CIO president, George Meany (Victoria Times, July 31/75) because these plants cannot show a profit. It should easily be noted that capitalism does not, and can not, incorporate its life force with human needs. There is not the slightest, remotest, connection between saving humanity and making profits. And governments are totally the child of reigning owners of capital.

Billions of humans are sacrificed on the altar of profit, both in the backward and the developed parts of this earth. Man as a species has the ability and resources to produce virtually unlimited abundance for himself, but his present social system prevents this happy possibility.

WJ

Hardworking Capitalists

The United Press London, reported that Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis wants her daughter to come home out of the range of Irish terrorist bombs. But Caroline is "staying put" to be near her 24 year-old boyfriend, an English art dealer whose uncle is a wealthy lord, Lord Ashcombe, to be exact. The report said,

The Ashcombe built Belgrave, one of London's most fashionable neighborhoods.

It must have been quite a sight. That handful of capitalists, with sleeves rolled up, sweating in the ditches, studiously drawing the plans, pouring the cement, laying the bricks and doing all the other construction work that must have been necessary to build Belgrave. -- a spectacle that the millions will never forget. And just as usual as the myth that those at the top of the pyramid produce their fantastic riches themselves.

Such closer to earth was another report in 1971 (Victoria Daily Colonist, March 14) that Henry Ford II flew into London with harsh words about Britain's labor troubles. He went straight to Prime Minister Heath of course, who was at the time the laughing rep. of the minority that owns Britain, to get something done about a six-week strike in the Ford auto plants which had lost \$62.2 million in wages for 50,000 workers and \$10.4 million worth of new autos for a few absentee shareholders. Not knowing the value of constant capital used in this period, it still looks like a good rate of exploitation for Ford

and his fellow shareholders. Too bad the strike is not perfect. If only the workers didn't have to be conditioned, threatened and cajoled into doing it. And if only they didn't balk occasionally, how much nicer it would be for the plutocracy.

In the meantime, Caroline Kennedy Onassis has been on the move. In addition to her boyfriend of the Ashcombes, she has searched for and found an opportunity to meet Prince Charles. Her mother is also a mover. After receiving the Japanese news, she rushed off to Paris and splashed \$20,000 on 36 new outfits from the top couturiers of that city. (Midnight, Sept. 17/75). The world is safe for the parasites for awhile.

POST SCRIPT

Latest evidence that world capitalism cannot shake its devotion to the profit motive is reference to the Guatemalan "quake" is supplied by Nancy Gibson, regional project co-ordinator of the OXFAM relief agency. Visiting Victoria, B.C. on a fund raising tour to help the poor to help the rich, she said:

The Guatemalan government has asked food deliveries be stopped because the influx is depressing local markets. (Victorian, March 24/76).

Now that the "emergency" is over those peasants and workers, who figure in the scheme of capital

expansion, must buy food produced for sale, to keep the food capitalists happy. These people in Guatemala who are not required for this process presumably will continue to go the same way as the surplus people have in the past. To their credit.

OSW's missionary for world capitalism also mentioned the housing problem in that country.

Money is important in the purchase of corrugated iron roofing, which can be purchased in nearby San Salvador.

A ration of ten corrugated iron sheets for a shack for each poor and homeless family and each family will pay one half of the exorbitant price of them of course. One wouldn't expect the owner of the mill in San Salvador to produce "housing" for the use of society. This trouble shooter for the international investment crowd explained.

I've been called a do-gooder, a radical and a leftist. But I'm able to cope with it. In many ways I'm very conservative.

Socialists would agree with her on that point. And the system can operate no other way.

Brief Study of the Left

Another hangover from the Russian bourgeois revolution. After Lenin's death, four ambitious leaders contended for the privilege of presiding over the exploitation of the Russian workers. The ruthless elimination process left Joe Stalin and Leon Trotsky, and later only Stalin, but not before Trotsky, in exile, had established the "Fourth International" of Trotskyist parties in various western countries. The main Trotskyist party in Canada is now known as the League for Socialist Action. As a latter day splinter of the organization that overruled the social division which superseded Marxist feudalism, the Canadian Trotskyists have no theory of understanding capitalism. In their progress class ownership of the means of life is to remain.

Part 4: League for Socialist Action

Having a grievance against Stalin, as the Macleods do, the "Trots" are Leninists too. Their pro-capitalist limitations are determined by the historical tie that binds them. Surrounded, as he was, by the pressures of an impending capitalism and the need to falsify Marxism, Lenin said, "the working class, exclusively by its own efforts, is able to develop only 'trade union consciousness'." (What is to be done) And, "If Socialism can only be realized when the intellectual development of all the people permits it, then we shall not see Socialism for 500 years". (Reported by John Reed). What he needed was a blindly obedient and politically ignorant working class. As a Leninist, Trotsky thought similarly, as do the leaders of his surviving party. Being regarded as racially inferior, the workers are to be told what to do for them by leaders who aim for positions of office and wealth, as managers of the existing predatory society, but with a redistribution of inequality in mind - an anti other leftist parties. They aim for what they call a "workers state", and nationalization of some industries, which leaves capitalism, and consequently its

ruling class of owners of the means of life untouched. Calling for a "Workers' state" is no different from calling for what prevails now, e.g. a capitalist state because the class cannot prevail without its counterpart. The existence of one is the condition for the existence of the other. Trotskyists use the expression of a "worker" to make a sense of a member of a separate class, and as such he receives wages for producing surpluses of wealth that being exclusively to the employing class. The consciousness of a worker's state is reminiscent of the promises given of Allende's Chile being told that they were "in power", while the wages, prices, profit mechanism of profit making, and the wealth of Chile's ruling section persisted.

All capitalist parties of the left, center and right reflect current society in an organization-right respect too. They are populated by two classes of people, the leaders and the "rank and file". The leaders are loyal to capitalist values and they try to keep the ideological ring in the process of the followers. Something like the of-

There is no private property in any of capitalism's spheres. The life is not just life and probably not even of the same order's complexity with Lenin in the crushing of the workers' revolt at Brest-Litovsk, or with the establishment of forced labor camps in France. (In G.G. Chomsky's "The Soviet Revolution, The Left-Wing Alternative"). The French workers were not socialist in their thinking. All they wanted were elementary rights from the "workers' state" of Lenin and Trotsky: Rights like independent unions and free speech. Rights that workers in western capitalist states have had for years. Rights that Trotskyist parties now believe to be out of office and in contradiction to the original thinking of their first ideologist.

Trotskyist parties are faithful to Bolshevism in another facet of their thinking. That is in concealing their commitment to the present system by waving another slogan in front of the workers called a "transitional program". This parallels Lenin and Stalin building capitalism in Russia, exploiting the workers, under the name of "Socialism" while promoting "Communism" later. Both Socialism and Communism are words describing a new and classless system that Bolshevik parties have never aimed for.

Not having the sympathetic ear of the workers to the degree that the NDP has, the USA urged the workers to vote for the NDP at the last federal election, but criticized provincial NDP for co-operating with Liberals and Conservatives in the preceding parliament, and asked the workers to "place no trust in the NDP's reformist, pragmatist program". "Trust" of course is a part of the concept of leaders and followers.

Instead of urging the ending of the productive relations of capital, wage-labor and money that is now so outdated and reactionary, the USA, with a nostalgic remnant of 19th century bourgeois change, supports establishment of some of its relationship in industrially underdeveloped area. It supports the native capitalist against against semi-feudal and Western capitalist control in places like south-east Asia, analogous these are to the profit motivated, neo-imperialist interests of the new rulers of China or the powerful state capitalists of Russia. The workers of the world do not need more capitalism's backward parts of the earth. They need World Socialism and the material conditions for its exist. The workers need the other ingredients: knowledge of capitalism, of how it causes the problems, of striving with the adequate world industrialization which is now a fact, to make it not merely a reality. The openly capitalist parties are retrograde, seeking to keep the workers' thinking on the present false values of the system. The Social Democratic or Labor parties and the Bolshevik parties are in the same camp, preserving the old, conservative ideas under false label of Socialism or Communism. It is 60 years since Lenin, Stalin, Trotsky and the other Bolsheviks started their misrepresentation in Russia, and in spite of the fact that there has been spread around the world with the active operation of the rulers of Western nations, it is a long time for some workers to be trapped by such transition.

A HANDBOOK OF SCIENTIFIC SOCIALISM

in thought and action

PERSPECTIVE FOR WORLD SOCIALISM

Based upon special 300th issue of
THE WESTERN SOCIALIST. A valuable
asset to any socialist library.

52 pages — \$1.00

In Victoria get your — **FULCRUM — WESTERN
SOCIALIST — SOCIALIST STANDARD** at:

Common College Bookstore
1750 Lansdowne

Ye Olde "T" Shoppe
819 Verdier Ave.
Downtown Bay

Griffin Books
587 Johnson St.

Question

Does your local bookstore
carry the **Fulcrum**?
If not, bother your bookseller.

INFORMATION CENTERS

Socialist Party of Canada
P.O. Box 1244, Stn. A
Vancouver, B.C. V6B 2V6
Socialist Party of Canada
P.O. Box 113
Windsor, Ont. N4A 2K1

Party Socialist du Canada
C.P. 264, Point St.
Montreal, Quebec
Socialist Party of Canada
P.O. Box 1600, Stn. A
Vancouver, B.C. V6B 2P1

In Vancouver get your — **FULCRUM — WESTERN
SOCIALIST — SOCIALIST STANDARD** at:

Vanguard Books
1208 Granville St.

The Nordic
140 E. Hastings St.

"The Labor Challenge", organ of the Trotskyist League for Socialist Action, in the Oct. 1972 issue said:

The Business Liberation Army's support for the SLA was not based on the party's program, which promises only reforms within the capitalist system. But unlike the Liberals and Conservatives, the SLA is a mass party of the organized labor movement in Canada, reflects the aspirations of hundreds of thousands of working people who don't want a party endorsement of big business that will fight for their needs.

Two Types of Conservatives with a "Revolutionary" Line"

The political ignorance and opportunism of the SLA is open here for all who desire to see it. The SLA is willing to support the false conclusion of hundreds of thousands of workers that the SLA is independent of big business and will fight for their needs, in spite of the fact that the SLA knows that the SLA's program

promises only reforms within the capitalist system.

What painful concessions these workers will endure in the interests of their capitalist trade. The SLA is no more opposed to big business than it is to big business's little brother. Thousands of workers have mistaken the SLA's posture against big profits by big business as being opposition to capitalism.

An understanding of the economics of the system would show them that profits are always the highest that circumstances will allow business to get whether it is big or small business. And hundreds of workers have been misled by the Trotskyist aim of "rule by labor" not capital as being opposition to capitalism. Both parties use the same manipulation to good effect. If the Trotskyists' source, the working class is to become the new "ruling class". Since both the SLA and the SLA regard capitalism's economic foundation of wages, prices, profit, the state, armed forces, etc. as being the natural order of things. It means therefore that in the SLA's new society the capitalist class, (which by its social nature is a ruling class) will still endure. Nothing basic will have changed, except that maybe the dominant section of society will pull the strings from just a little farther in the background than at present.

Fifty-eight years after Lenin nakedly and forcefully seized power from a temporary bourgeois democracy to create a bourgeois dictatorship — these "Marxist" and "Socialist" frauds are still at it.

The SLA and the Trotskyists, "Communists" and Marxists are factories of working class disillusionment for individuals who suspect capitalism

— of workers' social problems and act to act against the system. If some of these workers manage to discover that these clearly class-made are merely anti-class parties due to the system's classism, without too much sacrifice, they will have achieved to some extent, and will avoid a life of political disillusionment. And to date, it seems very few have discovered.

The capitalists of the world could not have wanted a better friend than they are now in the left.

WOMAN'S LIBERATION

A writer of the Socialist Party of Canada remarked to a woman leader in the headquarters of the Women's Action Committee that woman's liberation organizations left the basic social causes of women's problems untouched, and therefore could not solve them. The liberationists agreed, saying that woman's liberation is indeed just a band-aid on a cancer. BUT we have to be REALISTIC NOW. The contradictions in her old-time leftist patter actually resolves itself into politically ignorant confidence in patching up this old system. While leftists, like other leftists, enjoy the talk of both worlds their reformism is not a free choice after acquiring a scientific understanding of capitalism, which can be the only theoretical foundation for revolutionary change. While they pose as "moving the score" the new leftists are in the same mould as their parents. The Women's Liberation section of the working class are unconscious generally that they are part of a class separate, and with interests opposed to those of the rulers of society.

The liberationist referred to above, after saying that woman's liberation was relatively nothing, hastily went into reverse gear at high speed and insisted that it was not only "something" but better than that, it was "something NEW". The liberationist lip service to "revolution" is the stuff that some of capitalism's newspaper articles are made of. But this kind of active inaction postpones the date for the solution relatively farther into the future.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

OBJECT:

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments of producing and distributing wealth by and in interest of society as a whole.

SOCIALIST DIRECTORY

PARTY PUBLICATIONS

QUESTIONS OF THE DAY (S.P.G.B.)	\$1.00
RUSSIA 1917-1967 (S.P.G.B.)	.50
IS LABOUR GOVERNMENT THE WAY TO SOCIALISM (S.P.G.B.)	.50
SOCIALIST PARTY AND WAR (S.P.G.B.)	1.00
FAMILY ALLOWANCES (S.G.P.B.)	.50
SOCIALIST COMMENT (S.P.G.B.)	.50
RUSSIAN REVOLUTION (S.P.C.)	.50
HISTORICAL MATERIALISM (S.P.G.B.)	1.50
WORLD OF ABUNDANCE (S.P.C.)	.50

CLASSICS OF SOCIALIST SCIENCE

SOCIALISM, UTOPIAN AND SCIENTIFIC (Engels)	\$1.50
CIVIL WAR IN FRANCE (Marx)	1.50
WAGE LABOUR AND CAPITAL (Marx)	1.00
VALUE PRICE AND PROFIT (Marx)	1.50
MUTUAL AID (Kropotkin)	2.50
FOUNDATIONS OF CHRISTIANITY (Kautsky)	5.00
WOMEN UNDER SOCIALISM (Bebel)	5.50
COMMUNIST MANIFESTO (Marx)	.75
CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIALISM (Jarrow)	1.50

Order from Literature Agent,
Socialist Party of Canada,
P.O. Box 4280, Stn. A,
Victoria, B.C. V8X 3X8

ENQUIRY FORM

To the Socialist Party of Canada,
P.O. Box 4280, Stn. A, Victoria, B.C.

Please provide the following: (underline)	
POLYUM (Socialist Party of Canada) 8 issues	\$2.00
SOCIALISME MONDIAL (French, Parti Socialiste du Canada)	
4 issues	1.00
WESTERN SOCIALIST 12 issues	4.00
World Socialist Party of U.S.	
SOCIALIST STANDARD 2 issues	1.00
(American Party of Great Britain)	

Indorsements to literature at double rate.

I would also like to donate toward socialist activities

Further information about the policies and publications of the Socialist Party of Canada

I am interested in becoming a member

Name

Address

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

The Companion Parties of Socialism hold:

1. That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, tools, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whom alone wealth is produced.
2. That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.
3. That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.
4. That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.
5. That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.
6. That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly of the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the worker, the working class must organize consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and overthrow of plutocratic privileges.
7. That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interest of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.
8. THE COMPANION PARTIES OF SOCIALISM, therefore, enter the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labor or avowedly capitalist, and call upon all members of the working class of these countries to support their policy to the end that a termination may be brought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and in poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equity and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring membership in the Party should apply for Application for Membership from the secretary of nearest local or the National Headquarters.

These seven parties adhere to the same Socialist Principles:

LEAGUE OF DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISTS
Gustavogelstrasse 50, A 100 Vienna, Aust.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF AUSTRALIA
P.O. Box 1440, Melbourne, Aust. 2201 GPO

SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA
P.O. Box 4280, Stn. A, Victoria, B.C. V8X 3X8

SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN
52 Clapham High St., London SW 4, U.S.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF NEW ZEALAND
P.O. Box 324, Postal Centre, Wellington, N.Z.

WORLD SOCIALIST PARTY OF IRELAND
3 Pym St., Avenue Rd., Belfast, N. Ireland

WORLD SOCIALIST PARTY OF U.S.
295 Huntington Ave., Boston, Mass. 02113